

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed June 27, 2008 in the above-identified application.

New claim 17 is added. Therefore, claims 1-17 are the claims currently pending in the present application.

Claims 1-14 and 16 are amended to clarify features recited thereby. These amendments are fully supported by applicant's disclosure.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority and receipt of the priority document. Further, applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging review and consideration of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statements filed on October 5, 2006 and June 27, 2007.

Rejection of Claims 1-13, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rothballer, U.S. Patent No. 6,079,912. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Without intending to limit the scope of the claims, an effect or advantage according to an aspect of applicant's invention as claimed in claim 1 is that cutter inserts for a machining tool are provided which while identical with one another provide the functions of both roughing cutting edges and finishing cutting edges and thus the cutter inserts need not be distinguished from one another when attached to the machining tool. Accordingly, as explained, for example, in the paragraph bridging pages 18 and 19 and the first paragraph on page 19 thereafter of the Specification, when the cutter insert is positioned tangentially to the end face of the machining tool it will provide only the finish machining function (or only the roughing machining function), and when the cutter insert is positioned tangentially to the circumferential face of the machining tool it will provide only for the other of the roughing machining function or the finish machining function because only the relevant cutting edge of each cutter insert will interact with the workpiece.

Claim 1 requires a tool for metal-cutting machining of a bore surface, the tool comprising a first cutter insert, and a second cutter insert, and the first cutter insert oriented tangentially to the end face so as to serve either only for finish machining or only for roughing machining, and the second cutter insert oriented tangentially to the circumferential face so as to serve only for the other of either roughing machining or finish machining.

Rothballer discloses a cutter insert with a substantially hexagonal cutting face forming three main cutting edges and three auxiliary cutting edges alternating with the main edges, the main cutting edges usable for roughing and the auxiliary cutting edges for finishing (Rothballer, Abstract). Rothballer discloses an indexable cutting insert that during the same machining process does both roughing using its main cutting edge and finishing using its auxiliary cutting edge. The cutting insert can be used in combination with conventional inserts.

Rothballer does not disclose or suggest a cutter insert that either only roughens or only finishes depending on the position of the cutter insert on the machining tool. That is, Rothballer does not disclose or suggest a tool for metal-cutting machining with a cutter insert at the end face that serves either only for finish machining or only for roughing machining, as required by claim 1. Further, Rothballer does not disclose or suggest a cutter insert at the circumferential face so as to serve only for the other of either roughing machining or finish machining, as further required by claim 1. As discussed, Rothballer discloses that the cutter insert has a roughing edge which will rough the workpiece while the finishing edge of the same cutter insert will finish the workpiece, and thus Rothballer discloses that both the main and auxiliary edges interact with the workpiece during a single machining operation of the cutting insert. Accordingly, Rothballer does not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 1.

Claims 2-13, 15 and 16 depend from claim 1 and are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

New Claim

New claim 17 is added so as more fully to claim patentable aspects of applicant's invention. New claim 17 is fully supported by applicant's disclosure. Claim 17 depends from claim 1 and is thus patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING
SYSTEM ON **September 23, 2008**.

RCF:GB:ns

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Faber

Registration No.: 24,322

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700